



CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MARCH 2004 AGENDA

SUBJECT Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP): Proposed Intervention for (Cohorts I and II) schools that failed to show significant growth.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information
	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing

RECOMMENDATION

1. Determine the remaining Cohort I and II schools that will be deemed state-monitored, and
2. Assign a School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) to all state-monitored schools and allow local governing boards to retain legal rights, duties, and responsibilities with respect to any state-monitored school(s).

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

At the September 2003 State Board meeting, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted a revised definition of significant growth to align it with current legislation. Education Code Section 52055.5 (h) requires that any year between the third year of II/USP funding and the time a school exits the program, if the school does not make significant growth, the school is to be deemed state-monitored. Therefore, a yearly assessment on the status of schools "under watch" is required. The State Board made a technical revision to the significant growth definition to align with this requirement:

"Making positive growth on the Schoolwide Academic Performance Index (API) in either of the two funded implementation years and each year thereafter until the school exits the program."

At the November 2003 State Board Meeting, the Superintendent of Public Instruction recommended that thirty-nine II/USP schools (22 schools that demonstrated negative growth and 17 schools with invalid Growth APIs) be deemed state-monitored. The Board deemed twenty-two schools as state-monitored and required that their districts contract with an approved SAIT Provider.

A decision on 17 schools without valid API growth data was deferred until the January 2004 Board meeting in order to establish alternative criteria and provide these schools with an opportunity to demonstrate growth in student achievement. At the January 2004 Board meeting, Board members adopted an alternative definition of significant growth for schools with invalid APIs. It is based on the increase in the percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above proficient on the California Standards Test in English/language arts and mathematics (See Attachment 4 for alternative criteria).

At the January 2004 Board meeting, the members took the following actions:

- Six schools with invalid APIs that met the alternative criteria received a waiver that permitted them to be placed “on watch” status for the 2003-04 school year.
- Eleven schools without valid APIs that did not meet the alternative criteria or did not apply for a waiver were deemed state-monitored (10 of the schools were deferred from the November meeting and one school was added based upon the Phase II release of the API).
- Two new schools were deemed state-monitored because they made negative growth on the 2003 API (based on the release of the Phase II API data).
- Two schools that were previously deemed state-monitored had waivers approved that allowed the schools to be taken out of the sanctions process because of API data errors.
- Two schools were deferred until March 2004: Biggs High School because they were making corrections to their API data and Fruit Ridge Elementary because they qualified for a waiver under the alternative criteria for significant growth.

Therefore, there are currently 33 state-monitored schools for the 2003-04 school year, and 24 schools that became state-monitored in 2002-2003, although one school has subsequently closed.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The Phase III release of the 2003 Schoolwide API results may yield a number of additional II/USP Cohort I schools that failed to make significant growth this past year and a number of additional schools in II/USP Cohort II that failed to make significant growth in each of two implementation years in the II/USP program. Education Code Section 52055.5(b) directs the SBE to deem II/USP schools not showing significant growth as state-monitored. The Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), with the approval of the SBE, shall invoke sanctions from one of two Education Code sections:

1. According to the provisions of Education Code Section 52055.5(a), the SPI shall:
 - Assume all the legal rights, duties, and powers of the governing board, unless the SPI and the SBE allow the local governing board to retain these rights.
 - Reassign the principal of that school, subject to a hearing, and
 - Do one or more of the following with respect to a state-monitored school:
 - Revise attendance options
 - Allow parents to apply directly to the SBE to establish a charter school
 - Assign the management of the school to a school management organization
 - Reassign other certificated employees of the school
 - Renegotiate a new collective bargaining agreement at the expiration of the existing one
 - Reorganize the school
 - Close the school, and/or
 - Place a trustee at the school for no more than 3 years.
2. As an alternative to the above, the SPI, with the approval of the SBE, may require districts to contract with a School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) in lieu of other interventions and sanctions. If the State Board approves, the governing board of the school district may retain its legal rights, duties and responsibilities with respect to

that school. [Education Code Section 52055.51(a)]

- SAITs are teams of educators with experience in curriculum and instruction aligned to state standards, State Board-adopted texts in reading/language arts and mathematics, State Board-adopted intervention programs, academic assessment, and fiscal allocation.
- Teams are fielded by organizations approved by the SPI under criteria adopted by the SBE. Organizations are approved based on demonstrated evidence of turning around underperforming schools and trained on a state-designed intervention process.

SAIT teams verify information provided by the district on an Academic Program Survey, which results in a Report of Findings and Corrective Actions adopted by the local governing board, followed by the provision of technical assistance and support and quarterly monitoring of the school's academic progress toward meeting specified benchmarks for improvement. A Last Minute Memorandum will provide API Base and Growth information as part of attachments I, II and III for the appropriate years for each school.

FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)

See related March Board item on Expenditure Plan for appropriation of funds to non-Title I SAIT schools (as provided in item 6110-123-0001 of the 2003 Budget Act). Funds for Title I SAIT schools are provided in item 6110-136-0890 Schedule 1 of the 2003 Budget Act.

ATTACHMENT

[Attachment 4](#): Criteria for Cohort I and Cohort II II/USP Schools Without Valid APIs to Demonstrate Significant Academic Growth (2 pages)

The following attachments will be submitted in a Last Minute Memorandum:

Attachment 1: Table I - Contains the school performance data on the additional II/USP Cohort I schools that are subject to interventions/sanctions.

Attachment 2: Table II - Contains school performance data on the additional II/USP Cohort II schools that are subject to interventions/sanctions.

Attachment 3: Table III – Contains schools that qualify for waiver under the new waiver guidelines for schools without valid APIs as adopted by the State Board in January 2004.

Criteria for Cohort I II/USP Schools Without Valid APIs to Demonstrate Significant Academic Growth

Elementary schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in Mathematics Standards increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003.

Middle Schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students at or above the proficient level (schoolwide) on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards tests in the Mathematics Standards, General Math and Algebra I increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003.

High schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in General Mathematics, Algebra I and Geometry increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003.

Criteria for Cohort II II/USP Schools Without Valid APIs to Demonstrate Significant Academic Growth

Elementary schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2001 to 2002 **and** from 2002 to 2003 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in Mathematics Standards increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003.

Middle Schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students at or above the proficient level (schoolwide) on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2001 to 2002 **and** from 2002 to 2003 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards tests in the Mathematics Standards, General Mathematics and Algebra I increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003.

High schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2001 to 2002 **and** from 2002 to 2003 (note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), **and**
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in General Mathematics, Algebra I, and Geometry increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003.